

Bounding averages rigorously using semidefinite programming: mean moments of the Lorenz system

David Goluskin*

Department of Mathematics and Center for the Study of Complex Systems
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

November 14, 2016

Abstract

We describe methods for proving bounds on infinite-time averages in differential dynamical systems. The methods rely on the construction of nonnegative polynomials with certain properties, similarly to the way nonlinear stability can be proven by the construction of Lyapunov functions. Nonnegativity is enforced by requiring the polynomials to be sums of squares, a condition which is then formulated as a semidefinite program (SDP) that can be solved computationally. Although such computations are subject to numerical error, we demonstrate two ways to obtain rigorous results: using interval arithmetic to control the error of an approximate SDP solution, and finding fully analytical solutions to relatively small SDPs. We extend previous formulations to allow for bounds depending analytically on parametric variables. These methods are illustrated using the Lorenz equations, a system with three state variables (x, y, z) and three parameters (β, σ, r) . We bound infinite-time averages of all eighteen moments $x^l y^m z^n$ up to quartic degree that are symmetric under $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$. Bounds apply to all solutions regardless of stability, including chaotic trajectories, periodic orbits, and equilibrium points. The analytical approach yields two novel bounds over a range of (β, σ) that are perfectly sharp: the mean of z^3 can be no larger than its value of $(r-1)^3$ at the nonzero equilibria, and the mean of xy^3 can be no smaller than zero. The interval arithmetic approach is used at the standard chaotic parameters to bound eleven moments whose mean values are all maximized on a particular unstable periodic orbit. Our best upper bound on each such moment exceeds its mean value on the maximizing orbit by less than 1%. Many bounds reported here are much tighter than would be possible without computer assistance.

*Email: goluskin@umich.edu

1 Introduction

In the study of dynamical systems, especially chaotic systems, time-averaged quantities are often of more interest than the details of any particular solution trajectory. Such quantities are typically estimated by numerically integrating the system and averaging along the resulting trajectory. Here we take the complementary approach of proving bounds directly on infinite-time averages. This approach offers several advantages. In a dynamical system with parametric variables, bounds can apply to entire parameter ranges and can depend analytically on the parameters, whereas numerical integration informs only about the parameter values at which it is carried out. In a dynamical system with multiple local attractors, bounds can apply to all attractors, whereas a numerically integrated solution gives information only about the attractor in whose basin it begins. Furthermore, it is natural to derive bounds in a mathematically rigorous way, whereas producing rigorous results using numerical integration can be difficult.

The primary challenge in using bounds to estimate mean quantities is to construct bounds that are sufficiently tight, meaning they are close to the true values being bounded. Results that can be proven “by hand” are often too conservative, but computer-assisted methods introduced by Chernyshenko *et al.* [2] and developed further by Fantuzzi *et al.* [6] have given tighter results in several examples. These methods are part of an approach used often in the study of dynamics: constructing functions with certain special properties that imply the desired result. The most widely known instance is the proving of nonlinear stability by constructing Lyapunov functions, whose special properties include being nonnegative and non-increasing along trajectories. Bounds on time averages, which are our present objective, can be proven by constructing functions with related but different special properties. Historically, the main difficulty in applying Lyapunov’s method was the lack of a systematic way to construct Lyapunov functions. This has been partly overcome in the last fifteen years by sum-of-squares (SOS) relaxation, wherein nonnegativity of a function is replaced with the stronger condition that the function is representable as a sum of squares of polynomials [25]. Such relaxation is useful because an SOS condition can be equivalently formulated as a semidefinite program (SDP), a type of convex optimization problem solvable by various software packages [1]. The bounding methods developed in [2, 6] follow this same philosophy; SOS conditions are formulated that imply the desired bounds, and these SOS conditions are then formulated as SDPs.

The approach of bounding time averages using SDPs was applied to the van der Pol oscillator in [6], and very tight bounds were obtained for averages over the limit cycle. This success is promising, but the phase space of the van der Pol system is simple, consisting of one attracting orbit and one repelling equilibrium. In the present work we demonstrate that the SDP approach to bounding can succeed also for systems with much more complicated phase spaces. In particular we consider the Lorenz system [19],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}x &= -\sigma x + \sigma y, & \frac{d}{dt}y &= rx - y - xz, & \frac{d}{dt}z &= xy - \beta z, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Table 1: Summary of non-sharp upper bounds on time-averaged moments of the Lorenz system at the standard chaotic parameter values $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$. For each moment we have searched for the trajectory that maximizes its mean value. The tabulated percentage is the gap between this maximum value and the best upper bound we have proven. Details are given in §3.3 and §4.

Moment	Gap between maximum value and upper bound
y^2	0.046%
x^2z	0.00003%
y^2z	0.0099%
x^4	0.27%
x^3y	0.27%
x^2y^2	1.06%
x^2z^2	0.047%
xy^3	0.84%
y^4	0.92%
y^2z^2	0.047%
z^4	0.026%

and bound time averages of moments of the coordinates—that is, quantities of the form $x^l y^m z^n$ where $l, m, n \geq 0$ are integers. The bounds constructed here are global in the sense that they hold for all possible trajectories. (Methods for proving bounds holding only in particular basins of attraction or in the presence of noise are developed in [6].) Some of our results apply to large sets of the parameters (β, σ, r) , and others are specific to the standard chaotic values $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$. We assume $\sigma \neq 0$ throughout.

At the standard parameters of the Lorenz system we have bounded time averages of eighteen different moments. Upper bounds for seven moments (z , x^2 , xy , z^2 , xyz , z^3 , xyz^2) are perfectly sharp, meaning there exist trajectories on which the mean values of $x^l y^m z^n$ exactly equal the corresponding bounds. Some of these sharp bounds have been proven before, as discussed in §3.3.1. Our best upper bounds on the other eleven moments are summarized in table 1. All are all within 1% of being sharp, which would be nearly impossible without computer assistance.

A main contribution of the present work, aside from producing novel bounds for the Lorenz system, is that we extend the methods of [2, 6] to produce bounds that are mathematically rigorous, including some that depend analytically on the parameter r . Bounds implied by numerical SDP solutions are not rigorous because such solutions typically violate their equality and inequality constraints by small margins. These slight inaccuracies

can easily suggest false bounds since the SDPs are often ill-conditioned. Here we employ two complementary methods of proving rigorous bounds using SDPs. The first approach, which is described and illustrated in §4, is to compute an approximate numerical solution and then use interval arithmetic to bound how far it is from the true solution. This procedure is automated by the software package VSDP [13] and can produce very good bounds, but it can never produce perfectly sharp bounds because of the inherent conservativeness of interval arithmetic. The second approach, described and illustrated in §5, is to solve the relevant SDPs exactly. This can be done analytically for small SDPs [28] or otherwise using rational arithmetic [27, 14, 15, 38], and in certain situations exact SDP solutions yield perfectly sharp bounds.

Section 2 summarizes the formulation of SDPs that imply bounds on time averages and then extends this framework to parameter-dependent bounds. Section 3 reviews details about trajectories of the Lorenz system at the standard parameters and summarizes our relevant bounding results. Knowledge of trajectories is not needed to construct such bounds and is often unavailable, but since trajectories of the Lorenz system are well studied at the standard parameters we can use this information to judge the quality of our bounds. Sections 4 and 5 describe methods of obtaining rigorous bounds from SDPs using interval arithmetic and exact solutions, respectively, and report in detail the bounds we have proven for the Lorenz system by each approach. Bounds reported in §4 are not sharp and apply only at the standard chaotic parameter values, while bounds reported in §5 are perfectly sharp and apply over ranges of parameter values. Concluding remarks in section 6 address the promise and shortcomings of the SDP bounding methodology.

2 Bounding time averages using semidefinite programming

Consider a finite-dimensional dynamical system

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (2)$$

that is bounded, meaning all solution trajectories $\mathbf{x}(t)$ remain bounded as $t \rightarrow \infty$. For any function $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ of the state vector, let $\bar{\varphi}$ denote its infinite-time average along a trajectory:

$$\bar{\varphi} := \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t)) dt. \quad (3)$$

(Our results are unchanged if averages are defined using $\liminf$ instead of $\limsup$.) The value of $\bar{\varphi}$ may depend on the trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$ that is averaged over. Here we construct bounds on $\bar{\varphi}$ that are global; they apply to all trajectories. Section 2.1 describes sufficient conditions that, in various guises, are how such global bounds are typically proven. The formulation of SDPs that relax these sufficient conditions [2, 6] is reviewed in §2.2 and extended to parameter-dependent bounds in §2.3.

2.1 Sufficient conditions for bounding time averages

To bound averages over trajectories without knowing the trajectories themselves, we make use of integral constraints implied by the governing system (2). Such constraints are satisfied on all trajectories but are insufficient to determine the trajectories uniquely. This relaxation is crucial to making the analysis tractable; using the full constraint of the governing system would be tantamount to finding its trajectories exactly, which is generally not possible. Infinitely many constraints can be generated from the fact that time derivatives average to zero in bounded systems: for any differentiable scalar function $V(\mathbf{x})$ and any bounded trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$,

$$\overline{\frac{d}{dt}V} = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} [V(\mathbf{x}(T)) - V(\mathbf{x}(0))] = 0. \quad (4)$$

The chain rule gives $\frac{d}{dt}V = \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$, and therefore

$$\overline{\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V} = 0 \quad (5)$$

for any differentiable $V(\mathbf{x})$. The infinite choices for $V(\mathbf{x})$ in the above expression yield an infinitude of integral constraints that hold along every solution trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$. However, only particular choices of $V(\mathbf{x})$ yield constraints that help to prove a desired bound.

Suppose we want to prove that the lower bound $L \leq \bar{\varphi}$ holds along every trajectory, where L and the function $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ are specified. It would suffice to show that the bound holds pointwise on all trajectories, meaning $L \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, but this generally will not be true. Instead we can exploit the identity (5) by finding a $V(\mathbf{x})$ such that $L \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x})$ *does* hold for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This pointwise condition time-averages to $L \leq \bar{\varphi}$ and thus proves the result. Rearranging the pointwise inequality gives the sufficient condition

$$\exists V(\mathbf{x}) \text{ such that } \underbrace{\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - L + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x})}_{S_L(\mathbf{x})} \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \implies \quad L \leq \bar{\varphi}. \quad (6)$$

Analogous arguments give a similar sufficient condition for an upper bound:

$$\exists V(\mathbf{x}) \text{ such that } \underbrace{-[\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - U + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x})]}_{S_U(\mathbf{x})} \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \implies \quad \bar{\varphi} \leq U. \quad (7)$$

The choice of $V(\mathbf{x})$ will generally be different for $S_U(\mathbf{x})$ than for $S_L(\mathbf{x})$.

Simple example. Suppose we want to show that $\overline{xy} \geq 0$ for all solutions of the Lorenz equations (1). The identity (5) with $V = -\frac{1}{2\sigma}x^2$ reveals that $\overline{xy} = \overline{x^2}$ on all trajectories. Whereas $x(t)y(t) \geq 0$ is *not* true on all parts of the attractor, it is clearly true that $x(t)^2 \geq 0$ everywhere in phase space. This implies $\overline{x^2} \geq 0$ and thus the desired lower bound $\overline{xy} \geq 0$. In the nomenclature of condition (6), the sufficient condition proving the bound is $S_L(\mathbf{x}) = x^2 \geq 0$.

2.2 Sum-of-squares relaxation and semidefinite programming

Proving a lower bound using condition (6) poses two related challenges: finding a function $V(\mathbf{x})$ that makes $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ nonnegative, and showing that $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ is indeed nonnegative. In this work we consider only polynomial dynamics, meaning that each component of $\mathbf{f}$ is polynomial in the components of $\mathbf{x}$. We further restrict ourselves to polynomial $V(\mathbf{x})$, so that $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ is also polynomial. Even so it can be prohibitively difficult to determine whether $S_L(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ (it is NP-hard in general [23]), so we employ a standard SOS relaxation. That is, we require that $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ can be represented as a sum of squares of other polynomials, which is sufficient for $S_L(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ although not generally necessary [11]. In turn, the condition that $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ is SOS can be stated as a condition on the matrix representation of $S_L(\mathbf{x})$. This matrix representation, which is called a *Gram matrix*, is any symmetric matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ such that $S_L(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{b}$ is a specified vector of polynomial basis functions. As long as $\mathbf{b}$ contains enough basis functions, such a symmetric $\mathcal{Q}$ always exists and is often not unique. A polynomial is SOS if and only if it is possible to choose a positive semidefinite Gram matrix, $\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0$ (cf. [25]). In summary, we replace the sufficient condition of (6) by the stronger condition that $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ is SOS:

$$\exists V(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ such that } \underbrace{\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - L + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x})}_{S_L(\mathbf{x})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b} \text{ and } \mathcal{Q} \succeq 0 \implies L \leq \bar{\varphi}. \quad (8)$$

In practice, the sufficient condition (8) is applied by assuming a polynomial ansatz for $V(\mathbf{x})$ with free coefficients. This implies an ansatz for $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ in which these coefficients also appear. Based on the monomial terms in $S_L(\mathbf{x})$ it is simple to choose an adequate polynomial basis vector $\mathbf{b}$. Once $\mathbf{b}$ is fixed, the equality $S_L(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}$ furnishes affine constraints on the entries of $\mathcal{Q}$. (Matching coefficients on like monomials gives affine relations involving the entries of $\mathcal{Q}$ and the free coefficients of $V(\mathbf{x})$, but the latter coefficients can be eliminated if desired.) Thus, for a given $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatz the sufficient condition of (8) amounts to affine and semidefinite constraints on the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{Q}$. Finding a matrix subject to these two types of constraints is exactly what constitutes an SDP. Furthermore, this SDP can be posed as an optimization, searching for the maximum L for which there exists a $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying condition (8). With a given $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatz, the maximum lower bound $L^* \leq \bar{\varphi}$ that can be proven using the SDP formulation is

$$L^* = \max_{\mathcal{Q}} L \quad \text{subject to} \quad \underbrace{\varphi - L + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V}_{S_L(\mathbf{x})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{b}$ is any fixed basis vector that suffices to represent $S_L(\mathbf{x})$. By analogous arguments,

the minimum upper bound $\bar{\varphi} \leq U^*$ that can be proven with a given $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatz is

$$U^* = \min_{\mathcal{Q}} U \quad \text{subject to} \quad \overbrace{-[\varphi - U + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V]}^{S_U(\mathbf{x})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0.$$

Adding terms to the ansatz of $V(\mathbf{x})$ will either improve the optima L^* and U^* or leave them unchanged, although the approximate optima returned by numerical SDP solvers may change less predictably due to numerical conditioning getting worse as the dimension of $\mathcal{Q}$ increases.

SDP optimizations such as (9) and (10) are convex: the matrices $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying given affine and semidefinite constraints form a convex set. Various solvers are available to compute approximate numerical solutions, such as SDPT3 [35] or Mosek [22]. Numerical approximations to L^* and U^* returned by SDP solvers do not constitute mathematically rigorous bounds because of roundoff error, but their results can be made rigorous by the methods of §4 or §5. Furthermore, trial-and-error with numerical solutions can simplify subsequent rigorous analysis by suggesting terms that can be omitted from $V(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{b}$.

2.3 Parameter-dependent bounds

When a dynamical system is parameterized by some vector of parameters $\mathbf{p}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}), \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (11)$$

we can seek bounds that depend analytically on the parameters. If the bounds sought are polynomial in the components of $\mathbf{p}$, they can be constructed using the SDP framework. In the case of a polynomial lower bound $L(\mathbf{p})$, the sufficient condition (8) is extended by letting V and $\mathbf{b}$ be polynomials in the components of $\mathbf{p}$ as well as $\mathbf{x}$:

$$\exists V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}), \mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \text{ such that } \overbrace{\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) - L(\mathbf{p}) + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})}^{S_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b} \text{ and } \mathcal{Q} \succeq 0$$

$$\implies L(\mathbf{p}) \leq \bar{\varphi}, \quad (12)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the gradient with respect to $\mathbf{x}$ only. Once the V ansatz and basis vector $\mathbf{b}$ are specified, the sufficient condition (12) is an SDP. This condition can be posed as an optimization by maximizing some aspect of the lower bound. The simplest option is to maximize a constant l_0 in a lower bound of the form $l_0 + l_1(\mathbf{p})$, where the polynomial $l_1(\mathbf{p})$ is specified. Then the best lower bound that can be proven for a chosen V ansatz and $\mathbf{b}$ is $l_0^* + l_1(\mathbf{p}) \leq \bar{\varphi}$, where

$$l_0^* = \max_{\mathcal{Q}} l_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \overbrace{\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) - [l_0 + l_1(\mathbf{p})] + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})}^{S_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}, \quad (13)$$

$$\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0.$$

Analogously, the best upper bound is $\bar{\varphi} \leq u_0^* + u_1(\mathbf{p})$, where

$$u_0^* = \min_{\mathcal{Q}} u_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \overbrace{-[\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) - [u_0 + u_1(\mathbf{p})] + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})]}^{S_U(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b},$$

$$\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0. \tag{14}$$

The formulation (14) is applied in §5.3 and §5.4, where we prove the r -dependent upper bounds $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r-1)^2$ and $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r-1)^3$, respectively. The interval arithmetic methods of §4 can also give parameter-dependent bounds using (13) or (14), although we do not report such results here.

At least two obstacles can arise when treating parameters analytically, as opposed to fixing them numerically. The first occurs when trying to prove bounds that fail for some parameter values. An example for the Lorenz system is the bound $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r-1)^3$ that holds when $r \geq 1$. Since the bound fails for some $r < 1$ it cannot be proven by condition (12) if r is regarded as an arbitrary variable. In this instance the obstacle can be surmounted by instead proving $(r-1)\bar{z}^3 \leq (r-1)^4$, which is true for all r and implies the result sought. A second obstacle is that desirable choices of $L(\mathbf{p})$ or $V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ may be non-polynomial in $\mathbf{p}$, as occurs in §5 where our optimal choices of V are polynomial in r but non-polynomial in β and σ . This lets r be included analytically in the polynomial basis vector $\mathbf{b}$ to make $\mathcal{Q}$ independent of r , whereas $\mathcal{Q}$ generally must depend on β and σ . Parameters on which $\mathcal{Q}$ depends must be fixed numerically, except in SDPs small enough to permit analytical study.

3 The standard Lorenz system: phase space and bounds

Before summarizing the bounds we have proven for the Lorenz system (1) at the standard chaotic parameters, let us recall some features of its phase space against which we can judge the sharpness of the bounds reported below. Trajectories are bounded forward in time, and the global attractor to which all trajectories tend can be approximately located by finding trapping regions—subsets of phase space that all trajectories eventually enter and remain within. Various trapping regions have been constructed, including spheres, ellipsoids, and paraboloids whose coefficients depend on the parameters (cf. [33, 4]). One simple implication of these trapping regions is that $z \geq 0$ on the global attractor for all positive values of the parameters (β, σ, r) , meaning that as $t \rightarrow \infty$ every trajectory approaches a point or set of points in the half-space $z \geq 0$.

The Lorenz system has three equilibria: one at $\mathbf{x} = (0, 0, 0)$ that exists for all parameter values and two nonzero equilibria,

$$\mathbf{x}^{\pm} = (\pm \sqrt{\beta(r-1)}, \pm \sqrt{\beta(r-1)}, r-1), \tag{15}$$

that exist when $\beta(r-1) \geq 0$. The zero equilibrium is an example of a symmetric trajectory, meaning it is invariant under the symmetry $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$ of the governing equations.

The nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ comprise a pair of asymmetric trajectories that are mapped to one another by this symmetry. The stability of the equilibria and the existence of other invariant structures depend on the parameter values.

Section 3.1 details the phase space of the Lorenz system at the standard chaotic parameter values. Section 3.2 discusses the time-averaged moments we bound here and some exact relations between them. For each of these mean moments, the best available bounds and some numerical values on particular trajectories are summarized in §3.3. The construction of these bounds and others is detailed in sections 4 and 5.

3.1 Phase space at the standard parameters

The phase space of the Lorenz system (1) at the chaotic parameters $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$ originally considered by Lorenz [19] is very well studied. All three equilibria are unstable; the unstable manifolds of the zero and nonzero equilibria have dimensions of one and two, respectively. There also exist infinitely many periodic orbits, each of which is unstable with one stable and one unstable Floquet multiplier. However, the set of initial conditions lying on the equilibria or periodic orbits, or on their stable manifolds, has zero volume. Generic initial conditions instead produce chaotic trajectories, quickly converging to the strange attractor that has been proven to exist at the standard parameters [34]. Figure 1a shows a piece of such a chaotic trajectory projected onto the three coordinate planes. The complicated geometry of this strange attractor is built from simpler invariant structures: the zero equilibrium and every periodic orbit are part of the strange attractor, as are their unstable manifolds, and any chaotic trajectory eventually passes arbitrarily close to all of these structures (although close passes to the origin are very rare). The nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ are not embedded in the strange attractor but are nonetheless nearby; the Euclidean distance between $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ and the unstable manifold of the origin, which is part of the attractor, is about 1.56.

Each periodic orbit embedded in the Lorenz attractor can be labelled by a periodic sequence of $\oplus$ and $\ominus$ symbols, corresponding to the sequence in which it winds around the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^+$ and $\mathbf{x}^-$, respectively. Winding can be defined precisely using a Poincaré section such as the plane $z = r - 1$. At the standard parameters, this symbolic dynamics labels each orbit uniquely [32], but for some symbol sequences there does not exist a corresponding orbit. The one-symbol orbits $\oplus$ and $\ominus$ that would simply circle $\mathbf{x}^+$ and $\mathbf{x}^-$, respectively, are missing at the standard parameters, so every periodic orbit winds around both $\mathbf{x}^+$ and $\mathbf{x}^-$ at least once. Figure 1b shows the shortest orbit, which has sequence $\oplus\ominus$ and is symmetric. (The sequence $\ominus\oplus$ corresponds to the same orbit since it is a cyclic permutation of $\oplus\ominus$.) The second-shortest orbits are asymmetric and have sequences $\oplus\oplus\ominus$ and $\ominus\ominus\oplus$, or cyclic permutations thereof. Figure 1c shows the $\ominus\ominus\oplus$ orbit. (If desired, one can define a symmetry-invariant symbolic dynamics where orbits like $\oplus\oplus\ominus$ and $\ominus\ominus\oplus$ are identified [5].)

Since the bounds we construct here are global, they apply not only to the generic




Figure 1: Some trajectories of the Lorenz system at the standard parameters $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$: (a) part of a chaotic trajectory, (b) the symmetric periodic orbit $\oplus\ominus$, and (c) the asymmetric periodic orbit $\ominus\ominus\oplus$. The equilibria at the origin and at $\mathbf{x}^{\pm}$ are also shown. Chaotic trajectories are generic at these parameters; all equilibria and periodic orbits are unstable. Periodic orbits are from numerical computations of Viswanath [36] (cf. §3.3).

Table 2: The 18 moments $x^l y^m z^n$ up to quartic degree that are invariant under the symmetry $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$ of the Lorenz equations.

Degree	Symmetric moments
1	z
2	x^2, xy, y^2, z^2
3	x^2z, y^2z, xyz, z^3
4	$x^4, x^3y, x^2y^2, x^2z^2, xy^3, xyz^2, y^4, y^2z^2, z^4$

chaotic trajectories but also to all the non-generic trajectories that tend to equilibria or periodic orbits. For every average quantity $\bar{\varphi}$ that we have examined, the chaotic value is *not* extremal; there always exist periodic orbits, sometimes also equilibria, on which $\bar{\varphi}$ is larger or smaller than its chaotic value. (This is consistent with the interpretation of chaotic averages as weighted averages over periodic orbits [3].) Our bounds thus give estimates of chaotic averages that are at least slightly conservative since even a perfectly sharp global bound is saturated by an equilibrium or periodic orbit, not a chaotic orbit.

3.2 Symmetric moments

In this work we bound infinite-time averages of moments along trajectories—quantities of the form $x(t)^l y(t)^m z(t)^n$, where $l, m, n \geq 0$ are integers. We consider only moments that are symmetric under $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$, which is the case when $l + m$ is even. Antisymmetric moments, where $l + m$ is odd, average to zero on chaotic trajectories, although not on asymmetric non-generic trajectories such as the equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ or the periodic orbit $\ominus\ominus\ominus$ in figure 1c. Here we bound the moments listed in table 2, which are all of the symmetric moments whose degree $(l + m + n)$ is no larger than four.

Time-averaged values of moments can vary between different trajectories. All moments vanish at the zero equilibrium. Symmetric moments at the nonzero equilibria (15) take the values

$$x^l y^m z^n|_{\mathbf{x}^\pm} = \beta^{(l+m)/2} (r - 1)^{(l+m)/2+n}. \quad (16)$$

The time average $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ is the same on every chaotic trajectory at parameters where the strange attractor is ergodic, whereas it generally varies between different periodic orbits.

For convenience we define the normalized mean moment $\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}$ on a trajectory as the time average $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ on that trajectory, divided by the moment’s value (16) at the nonzero equilibria,

$$\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}} := \frac{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}{x^l y^m z^n|_{\mathbf{x}^\pm}}. \quad (17)$$

Bounds are often reported here in terms of $\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}$, although we constructed them using the unnormalized averages $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$. For trajectories on the stable manifolds of the zero

and nonzero equilibria, $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} = 0$ and $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} = 1$, respectively. Other values of $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ occurring on chaotic or periodic trajectories cannot be calculated exactly, but numerical approximations are reported in the next subsection.

Some mean moments of the Lorenz system are proportional *a priori* and thus have identical normalized values. This can be deduced from the general identity $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V = 0$ by choosing $V = \frac{1}{n\sigma} x^n$ and $V = -\frac{1}{n} z^n$, respectively, to find the proportionality relations

$$\overline{x^{n-1}y} = \overline{x^n}, \quad \overline{xyz^{n-1}} = \beta \overline{z^n} \quad (18)$$

that hold along each trajectory for all $n \geq 1$. The first few equalities in these families ($n = 1, 2, 3$) relate time averages of some of the symmetric moments studied here:

$$\overline{x^2} = \overline{xy} = \beta \overline{z}, \quad \overline{x^4} = \overline{x^3 y}, \quad \overline{xyz} = \beta \overline{z^2}, \quad \overline{xyz^2} = \beta \overline{z^3}. \quad (19)$$

Among the above moments, we construct bounds on $\overline{z}$, $\overline{z^2}$, $\overline{z^3}$, and $\overline{x^4}$, and these imply bounds on the other five moments also. This is why proportional moments are grouped together when bounds are reported in tables 3, 4, and 5 below.

Beyond the proportionality relations (19), there exist infinitely many relations involving three or more mean moments. Some of these relations underlie our present bounding methods, such as those of the form $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} = \overline{L + S_L(x, y, z)}$ sought by the lower bound condition (6). Other polynomial relations that may not help to prove bounds can be useful in other ways. For instance, the equalities of table 6 in Appendix B reveal that the mean values of all eighteen moments listed in table 2 are linear combinations of just six: $\overline{z}$, $\overline{z^2}$, $\overline{y^2 z}$, $\overline{z^3}$, $\overline{y^2 z^2}$, and $\overline{z^4}$. Such relations are useful for computing exact values of mean moments in terms of other exact values, but they are of limited use in deriving sharp bounds. To see why, consider the expression $\overline{y^2} = \beta(r\overline{z} - \overline{z^2})$. On any particular trajectory, $\overline{z}$ and $\overline{z^2}$ determine $\overline{y^2}$. However, globally sharp bounds on $\overline{z}$ and $\overline{z^2}$ do *not* give a sharp upper bound on $\overline{y^2}$. This is because the maxima of $\overline{y^2}$, $\overline{z}$, and $-\overline{z^2}$ occur on different trajectories—on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit, the $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ equilibria, and the zero equilibrium, respectively. Bounding $\overline{y^2}$ directly using the SDP (10) gives a better result.

3.3 Summary of bounds at the standard parameters

Let us summarize the best known bounds on the eighteen mean moments listed in table 2. A few of these have been reported previously and the rest are constructed in sections 4 and 5. All symmetric moments up to quartic degree obey *lower* bounds of zero (cf. §5.5), and these bounds are saturated by trajectories at or tending to the zero equilibrium. Table 3 gives the best known *upper* bounds on these mean moments, expressed in terms of their normalizations $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$. For each moment, table 3 also gives a numerical approximation of $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ on a chaotic trajectory, as well as on the trajectory where that mean moment is largest. Moments that are grouped together have identical values of $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ according to (19).

Table 3: Normalized mean values, $\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}$, of all symmetric moments of the Lorenz system up to quartic degree at the standard chaotic parameters $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$. For each mean moment, we report the chaotic value, the value on the maximizing equilibrium or periodic orbit, and the best upper bound constructed here. (The bounds on $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ have been reported previously also [20, 16].) Underlined digits of each bound are sharp. Moments grouped together (such as z , x^2 , xy) have identical normalized mean values according to (19). All tabulated moments for which $\max_{\mathbf{x}(t)} \overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}} > 1$ are maximized on the $\oplus\ominus$ periodic orbit.

Moment	$\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}$		
	Chaotic	Maximum	Upper bound
z, x^2, xy	0.87223	1	<u>1</u>
y^2	1.12780	1.1621684	<u>1.1627</u>
z^2, xyz	0.86276	1	<u>1</u>
$x^2 z$	0.96689	1	<u>1.0000003</u>
$y^2 z$	1.02733	1.0394975	<u>1.0396</u>
z^3, xyz^2	0.93716	1	<u>1</u>
$x^4, x^3 y$	1.74779	1.9111906	<u>1.9164</u>
$x^2 y^2$	2.07089	2.2975630	<u>2.3220</u>
$x^2 z^2$	1.15101	1.1893425	<u>1.1899</u>
xy^3	2.65721	2.9987454	<u>3.0239</u>
y^4	3.62466	4.1459937	<u>4.1842</u>
$y^2 z^2$	1.03615	1.0484088	<u>1.0489</u>
z^4	1.09006	1.1155092	<u>1.1158</u>

The chaotic and maximal values of $\overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}}$ in table 3 are not needed to prove bounds but are useful in understanding them. The chaotic averages were approximated by numerically integrating the Lorenz equations over a time interval of 10^7 using fourth-order Runge–Kutta time steps of size 10^{-3} , resulting in a trajectory that wound around the nonzero equilibria more than 13 million times. Most of these time averages are converged to the precision shown, but a few (x^4 , $x^2 y^2$, xy^3 , and y^4) are perhaps converged to only four decimal places. To find the trajectory that maximizes each mean moment we examined every periodic orbit in a numerical library provided by Viswanath [36, 37] that includes all orbits up to 13 symbols in length and some longer ones with sequences of the form $\oplus^N \ominus$ or $\oplus^N \ominus^N$. Eight of the moments are maximized by trajectories on or tending to the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, meaning $\max_{\mathbf{x}(t)} \overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}} = 1$. All other mean moments in table 3 are maximized by trajectories on or tending to the $\oplus\ominus$ periodic orbit of figure 1b, in which case $\max_{\mathbf{x}(t)} \overline{\overline{x^l y^m z^n}} > 1$. In fact we find that all symmetric moments of degrees five through

nine are also maximized on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit, while some higher-order moments including x^2y^8 , xy^9 , and y^{10} are maximized on longer periodic orbits.

3.3.1 Sharp upper bounds

A global bound on $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ is sharp if there exist trajectories where $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ is equal to the bound or comes arbitrarily close to it. Among the upper bounds given in table 3, the perfectly sharp bounds are those on $\overline{z}$, $\overline{z^2}$, and $\overline{z^3}$, along with the moments $\overline{x^2}$, $\overline{xy}$, $\overline{xyz}$, and $\overline{xyz^2}$ that are proportional to one of the first three according to (19). The normalizations of these sharp global bounds are $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} \leq 1$, meaning each moment is maximized by the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$. The sharp upper bounds on $\overline{z}$ and $\overline{z^2}$ were proven for all positive parameters by Malkus [20] and Knobloch [16], respectively, and have been rediscovered by various authors [7, 31]. These proofs essentially use the sufficient condition (10) but are simple enough that sum-of-squares representations of $S_U(\mathbf{x})$ were found without computer assistance. In §5.3 we illustrate how the bound on $\overline{z^2}$ (which also implies the bound on $\overline{z}$) can be constructed systematically using the SDP framework. We then use this framework in §5.4 for a more complicated construction that proves a novel sharp bound on $\overline{z^3}$ for all r and a range of (β, σ) . Numerical evidence suggests that $\overline{x^2 z}$ also is bounded above by its value at $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, but our best upper bound on $\overline{x^2 z}$ is not quite sharp.

3.3.2 Non-sharp upper bounds

Most of the upper bounds in table 3 are not perfectly sharp, although all are very good. In our framework, sharp bounds on $\overline{\varphi}$ are possible only when the trajectory that maximizes $\overline{\varphi}$ is an algebraic set, meaning it can be specified by a polynomial equation (cf. §4.3). This is true of moments maximized at the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ but not of those maximized on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit. We obtained the non-sharp bounds in table 3 using the interval arithmetic approach detailed in §4 below. All are within 1% of the apparently maximal values of $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ found on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit, and some are much tighter.

3.3.3 Margins between bounds and chaotic averages

Although bounds holding for all trajectories cannot be sharp for chaotic mean values, they come fairly close in a number of cases. Six of the upper bounds in table 3 exceed the corresponding chaotic averages by less than 6%. This is possible because the averages of these moments on the trajectories where they are maximized are not much larger than on chaotic trajectories. Meanwhile, the global lower bounds of zero, which are saturated by the equilibrium at the origin, are poor approximations of chaotic averages. To prove bounds on chaotic averages that are tighter than the best possible global bounds, further methods are needed. Some such methods are studied by [6], but they do not help much with the Lorenz system for reasons discussed in §6.

4 Non-sharp bounds using interval arithmetic

One way to construct a rigorous bound using SDP optimization is to find an approximate numerical solution and then apply perturbation methods, made rigorous by interval arithmetic, to estimate how far the true optimum is from the numerical one. Here we do so using the software package VSDP [13], which automates this approach. Section 4.1 describes the method, including why the bounds produced can be very good but never perfectly sharp. Section 4.2 reports upper bounds found by applying this method to the Lorenz system at the standard parameter. Section 4.3 explains why tight bounds are easier to prove on some quantities than on others, both in the Lorenz example and in general.

4.1 Perturbation methods with interval arithmetic

For a chosen V ansatz, the best bound that can be proven by the upper bound SDP (10), for example, is the exact optimum U^* . Numerical SDP solvers only approximate this optimum and the matrix Q^* that achieves it. However, perturbation methods can be applied to this approximate Q^* to find an enclosure $[U^-, U^+]$ that contains the true optimum U^* . The software VSDP implements this procedure by employing an external SDP solver (we use SDPT3 [35]) and the interval arithmetic package INTLAB [29] to rigorously enclose U^* . When VSDP succeeds, the result is a verified upper bound $\bar{\varphi} \leq U^+$. This approach works well in a number of situations but has two main limitations. The first is purely numerical: if the dimension of phase space and/or the polynomial degree of $S_U(\mathbf{x})$ are too large, VSDP may return a value of U^+ that is extremely conservative or infinite. The second limitation, inherent to any perturbative approach, is that U^+ is always strictly larger than U^* . This is not important in the many cases where U^+ is close to U^* , and U^* is not a sharp bound anyway. In some cases, however, the exact U^* gives a sharp bound. Such bounds can be proven by finding exactly optimal SDP solutions, which is the approach taken in §5.

4.2 Non-sharp bounds for the Lorenz system at the standard parameters

For the Lorenz system at the standard chaotic parameter values $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (3/8, 10, 28)$, we have constructed upper bounds on all eighteen moments listed in table 2 by applying the VSDP software to the SDP (10). Results are reported as bounds on the normalized mean moments $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ defined by (17). We have constructed bounds using $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatze of degree 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10. Each ansatz for $V(\mathbf{x})$ includes all symmetric monomials except some that can be excluded at the highest degree (cf. §5.2 below).

For the mean moments whose maxima occur on the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, in which case $\max_{\mathbf{x}(t)} \overline{x^l y^m z^n} = 1$, enclosures $[U^-, U^+]$ containing upper bounds on $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ are reported in table 4. For the other mean moments, all of whose maxima appear to occur on the $\oplus\ominus$ periodic orbit, verified upper bounds $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} \leq U^+$ are reported in table 5. The apparently maximal values of these moments on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit are tabulated also. The results in tables

Table 4: Enclosures of upper bounds on normalized mean moments $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ of the Lorenz system at the standard parameter values $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$. The tabulated moments are those maximized at the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, so the sharp upper bounds would be $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} \leq 1$, whereas the verified upper bounds are $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} \leq U^+$. In the three cases where moments are listed together because they are related by (19), the moments used in the bounding SDPs were z , z^2 , and z^3 . Underlined digits indicate agreement between U^- and U^+ .

Moment	Enclosure $\begin{bmatrix} U^- \\ U^+ \end{bmatrix}$ containing upper bound on $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$			
	degree 2	degree 4	degree 6	degree 8
z, x^2, xy	$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{0.99999999989} \\ \underline{1.00000000009} \end{bmatrix}$			
z^2, xyz	$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{0.99999999994} \\ \underline{1.00000000004} \end{bmatrix}$			
z^3, xyz^2		$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{0.99999999986} \\ \underline{1.00000000002} \end{bmatrix}$		
$x^2 z$		$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{1.002366851} \\ \underline{1.002366853} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{1.00066032} \\ \underline{1.00066039} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{0.9990309} \\ \underline{1.0000003} \end{bmatrix}$

4 and 5 are discussed in §4.2.1 and §4.2.2, respectively. Further details on the computations leading to these results are given in Appendix A.

4.2.1 Moments maximized by the nonzero equilibria

For the mean moments that are maximized on the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, it is possible to prove the perfectly sharp upper bounds $\overline{x^l y^m z^n} \leq 1$ using the SDP (10) with V of finite degree. The V ansatz must have enough terms for the optimum U^* of the SDP to equal the maximal value (16) of $x^l y^m z^n$ at $\mathbf{x}^\pm$. Any upper enclosure U^+ verified by VSDP will be strictly larger than U^* and thus not a sharp bound. Nonetheless, the enclosures shown in table 4 give verified bounds U^+ that are very close to sharp, and they can inform proofs of exactly sharp bounds by suggesting what terms are needed in V . These enclosures suggest that the exact optima U^* yield sharp bounds on $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ for V of degree 2, on $\bar{z}^3$ for V of degree 4, and on $\bar{x}^2 \bar{z}$ for V of degree 8. At these degrees, each enclosure is very narrow and includes the value $U = 1$ that would be sharp. The apparent sharpness of the exact U^* is confirmed for $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ by past analytical results (cf. §5.3) and for $\bar{z}^3$ by the sharp bound we prove in §5.4 using quartic V . For the mean moment $\bar{x}^2 \bar{z}$, V of degree 4 or 6 are evidently *not* sufficient to prove the sharp bound since $U^- > 1$. We have not confirmed that a degree-8 V indeed yields $U^* = 1$; instead we settle for the slightly imperfect bound

Table 5: Verified upper bounds U^+ on normalized mean moments $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$ of the Lorenz system at the standard parameter values $(\beta, \sigma, r) = (8/3, 10, 28)$. The tabulated moments are all the symmetric moments up to quartic degree that are *not* maximized by the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$. Bounds are shown for $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatze of degree 2 through 10, along with the maximum known values of $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$, which apparently all occur on the $\oplus\ominus$ orbit. The moments x^4 and $x^3 y$ are listed together because they are related by (19); bounds were computed using x^4 . Underlined digits of each bound are sharp.

Moment	Upper bound					Maximum
	degree 2	degree 4	degree 6	degree 8	degree 10	
y^2	7.2593	<u>1.2585</u>	<u>1.1694</u>	<u>1.1627</u>	<u>1.1649</u>	1.1621684
$y^2 z$		<u>1.0480</u>	<u>1.0404</u>	<u>1.0396</u>	<u>1.0397</u>	1.0394975
$x^4, x^3 y$		<u>2.5702</u>	<u>2.1334</u>	<u>1.9318</u>	<u>1.9164</u>	1.9111906
$x^2 y^2$		<u>3.8772</u>	<u>2.7756</u>	<u>2.3514</u>	<u>2.3220</u>	2.2975630
$x^2 z^2$		<u>1.2822</u>	<u>1.2053</u>	<u>1.1905</u>	<u>1.1899</u>	1.1893425
$x y^3$		<u>4.7666</u>	<u>3.9332</u>	<u>3.1236</u>	<u>3.0239</u>	2.9987454
y^4		<u>18.766</u>	<u>6.1518</u>	<u>4.4757</u>	<u>4.1842</u>	4.1459937
$y^2 z^2$		<u>1.1226</u>	<u>1.0640</u>	<u>1.0492</u>	<u>1.0489</u>	1.0484088
z^4		<u>1.1966</u>	<u>1.1199</u>	<u>1.1158</u>	<u>1.1168</u>	1.1155092

$\overline{x^2 z} \leq 1.0000003$. (At some β and σ other than the standard values, we have found that a sharp bound on $\overline{x^2 z}$ can be proven with a V that is only quartic.)

4.2.2 Moments maximized by the $\oplus\ominus$ periodic orbit

For the mean moments in table 5, all of which are apparently maximized by the $\oplus\ominus$ periodic orbit rather than by an equilibrium, the SDP approach cannot produce a perfectly sharp upper bound for reasons explained in the next subsection. Instead we expect the optimum U^* of the SDP (10) to approach a sharp bound as the degree of $V(\mathbf{x})$ approaches infinity. The verified bound U^+ returned by VSDP does *not* become sharp in this limit since enclosures become more conservative (or infinite) as SDPs grow in size. In practice the smallest value of U^+ is achieved by a $V(\mathbf{x})$ ansatz of intermediate degree. The verified bounds in table 5 continue to improve up to degree 8 or 10 but get worse thereafter. The best bounds on the various moments in table 5, all of which are within 1% of being sharp, have been summarized in table 3 above.

4.3 Why certain quantities are more difficult to bound

To understand why some quantities are harder to bound than others, suppose one wants to prove an upper bound $\overline{\varphi} \leq U$ that is indeed true. Proving this bound using the sufficient

condition (7) requires choosing $V(\mathbf{x})$ such that $S_U(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, meaning that

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x}) \leq U - \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (20)$$

must hold for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This inequality constrains the choice of $V(\mathbf{x})$, and it is more constraining when U is smaller, which is why tighter bounds are generally harder to prove. To see explicitly how the inequality (20) constrains $V(\mathbf{x})$, let us consider what it requires near equilibrium points and on periodic orbits.

4.3.1 Equilibrium points

At every equilibrium point $\mathbf{x}^*$, the inequality (20) is automatically satisfied for all $V(\mathbf{x})$ and all valid upper bounds U since $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$. However, $V(\mathbf{x})$ is constrained in the neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}^*$. It is most constrained when U^* is a sharp bound saturated by $\mathbf{x}^*$, in which case both sides of (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}^*$. For this to occur while the inequality holds in the neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}^*$, both S_U and ∇S_U must vanish at $\mathbf{x}^*$. These demands on $V(\mathbf{x})$ can generally be met by a polynomial of finite degree, which is why sharp upper bounds are possible for mean moments of the Lorenz system that are maximized by the equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, such as $\bar{z}$, $\bar{z}^2$, and $\bar{z}^3$.

4.3.2 Periodic orbits

When the trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$ that maximizes $\bar{\varphi}$ is a periodic orbit, it is not typically possible to prove a sharp bound U using a polynomial $V(\mathbf{x})$. This is because both sides of the inequality (20) average to zero over the maximizing orbit, so the inequality can hold pointwise only if $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x}) = U - \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ everywhere on the orbit. As observed in [6], this is impossible with polynomial $V(\mathbf{x})$ in the typical case where the orbit is not an algebraic set, meaning that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ cannot be specified by a polynomial equation. Nevertheless, the results of table 5 show that $V(\mathbf{x})$ of modest degree can yield bounds quite close to the value of $\bar{\varphi}$ on the maximizing periodic orbit.

Even when trying to prove a sharp bound that is saturated by an equilibrium point instead of a periodic orbit, the existence of periodic orbits can constrain $V(\mathbf{x})$ strongly. Suppose $\bar{\varphi}$ on some orbit is smaller than U , but not by much. The inequality (20) must hold at all points, its lefthand side averages to zero along the orbit, and its righthand side averages to a small positive number. These conditions do not determine $V(\mathbf{x})$ uniquely but do require that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla V(\mathbf{x})$ remain close to $U - \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ along most of the orbit, which in some cases requires the polynomial degree of $V(\mathbf{x})$ to be large. This might explain the implication of table 4 that proving sharp upper bounds on $\bar{z}^3$ and $\bar{x^2 z}$ requires $V(\mathbf{x})$ of degree 4 and 8, respectively. Both average moments are maximized on the $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ equilibria at the standard parameters, but the second-largest values we have found for $\bar{z}^3$ and $\bar{x^2 z}$ (on the $\oplus^{12}\ominus^{12}$ and $\oplus\ominus$ orbits) are smaller than the maximum values by 5.6% and 3.3%, respectively, meaning the margin $U - \bar{\varphi}$ is more constraining in the case of $\bar{x^2 z}$.

5 Sharp bounds using exactly optimal SDP solutions

Whereas rigorous bounds in §4 are constructed from approximate SDP solutions, the present section describes a different approach in which SDPs are solved exactly. Unlike the approach of §4, exact solutions can verify not only suboptimal SDP solutions but also exact optima. This is particularly valuable when the optima give sharp bounds, which is possible when the trajectories saturating the bounds are algebraic sets (cf. §4.3). In the example of the Lorenz system, we can hope to prove sharp lower bounds that are saturated by the zero equilibrium and sharp upper bounds that are saturated by the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$. The symmetric moments that appear to be maximized on $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, at least at the standard parameters, are the eight listed in table 4 above.

Section 5.1 discusses how to find exact SDP solutions, including the additional complications that arise when seeking optimal solutions. We then apply this approach to the Lorenz system. Section 5.2 explains how the SDP framework can be tailored to exploit some particular features of the Lorenz equations. Sharp upper bounds on $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ holding for all positive parameters have been proven by previous authors, and §5.3 restates the proof for $\bar{z}^2$ in the SDP framework. The sharp upper bound $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r-1)^3$ holding when $r \geq 1$ is proven in §5.4 for a subset of the (β, σ) plane that includes the standard values $(8/3, 10)$. Sharp lower bounds of zero are constructed in §5.5 for the few moments up to quartic degree where they are not trivial.

5.1 Finding exactly optimal SDP solutions

Suppose we want to prove a sharp upper bound by verifying an exact optimum U^* of the bounding SDP (10). If the optimum can be anticipated, then for this value of U we must find a matrix $\mathcal{Q}^* \succeq 0$ that exactly satisfies the relation $S_U = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q}^* \mathbf{b}$. A potential difficulty is that optimal solutions are only marginally feasible, meaning there exist $\mathcal{Q}^* \succeq 0$ that are singular but none that are strictly positive definite. To see how this manifests when constructing bounds, suppose that $\mathbf{b}$ contains the minimum number of terms needed such that S_U can be represented as $S_U = \mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}$ for any U . If the value of U is fixed rather than optimized, the SDP becomes a feasibility problem that is strictly feasible when $U > U^*$, marginally feasible when $U = U^*$, and infeasible when $U < U^*$. In other words, the matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ can be nonsingular when $U > U^*$ but has additional null vectors at the optimum [1].

Although marginally feasible SDPs sometimes can be solved in practice, it may be easier to project them onto smaller SDPs that are strictly feasible. Suppose we can find a matrix $\mathcal{B}$ whose rows are a basis for the image of $\mathcal{Q}^*$. Sometimes $\mathcal{B}$ can be found by inspection, as in §5.3 and §5.4, and otherwise it can be sought with computer assistance [21]. Rather than searching for the singular matrix $\mathcal{Q}^*$, we can search for a smaller nonsingular $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}^* = \mathcal{B}^T \hat{\mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{B}$. This yields a strictly feasible SDP for $\hat{\mathcal{Q}} \succeq 0$ whose affine constraints are given by $S_U = \hat{\mathbf{b}}^T \hat{\mathcal{Q}} \hat{\mathbf{b}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathcal{B} \mathbf{b}$ is a projection of the larger polynomial basis onto the image of $\mathcal{Q}^*$. The reduced formulation is useful for verifying U^* , although the larger

basis $\mathbf{b}$ is still needed when solving an optimization problem for U since the reduced basis $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ can represent S_U only when $U = U^*$.

5.1.1 Analytical exact solutions

Very small SDPs can be solved analytically by hand [28] or using computer algebra [30, 10]. This approach quickly becomes intractable as $\mathcal{Q}$ grows because the algebraic degree of solutions becomes very large [24]. (We have had trouble with 8×8 matrices.) One advantage of the analytical approach is that $\mathcal{Q}$ can depend analytically on parameters, which is more flexible than having a parameter-dependent basis $\mathbf{b}$ as described in §2.3 because the parameter-dependence of $\mathcal{Q}$ need not be polynomial. We exploit this in the constructions of §5.3 and §5.4 by letting $\mathcal{Q}$ depend on β and σ , while the basis $\mathbf{b}$ depends on r . A second advantage of the analytical approach is that it is not substantially changed if the SDP is only marginally feasible. Even so, we find it convenient in our proofs to project marginally feasible SDPs onto strictly feasible ones, as described in the preceding paragraph.

5.1.2 Exact solutions in terms of rational numbers

Exact solutions to SDPs of moderate or large size can be found by a symbolic-numerical approach wherein approximate numerical solutions are projected onto the rational numbers in a way that exactly satisfies the affine and semidefinite constraints. Any parameters on which $\mathcal{Q}$ depends must be fixed numerically to rational values, thereby yielding a bound at only these values. Rational solutions exist for all strictly feasible SDPs, so in principle any suboptimal case can be verified. Optimal solutions $\mathcal{Q}^*$ must sometimes be irrational (as when the optimum is irrational) but often can be rational. Section §5.4.3 gives an example of a rational $\mathcal{Q}^*$ that certifies the sharp bound $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r-1)^3$ in the Lorenz system at the standard parameters $(\beta, \sigma) = (8/3, 10)$. In this instance the SDP is small enough that a rational $\mathcal{Q}^*$ can be found analytically. Larger SDPs must be solved numerically and then projected onto the rationals with computer assistance [27, 14, 15, 38], but we do not implement such methods here.

5.2 Exploiting the structure of the Lorenz system

The bounding SDPs (9) and (10) can often be tailored to exploit particular features of the equations being studied. In the example of the Lorenz system, we can exploit both the symmetry $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$ and the nature of the quadratic nonlinearity. The symmetry is shared by the equations and the quantities $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ being bounded, so we can choose the V ansatz to be symmetric also; there is no advantage to a non-symmetric ansatz because the optimal choice of its coefficients will make it symmetric. Recalling the definitions

$$S_L(\mathbf{x}) := \varphi - L + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V, \quad (21)$$

$$S_U(\mathbf{x}) := -[\varphi - U + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V], \quad (22)$$

we see that S_L and S_U are also symmetric. These are the polynomials that must be nonnegative to imply lower and upper bounds, respectively, so they must be of even degree. We choose V ansatz of even degree. For S_L and S_U to be even also, the quadratic terms of $\mathbf{f}$ must cancel in $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$, which occurs only when the highest-degree terms of V all take the form $x^p(y^2 + z^2)^q$ [33]. Given this constraint and the symmetry condition, the most general bases we can choose for V are

$$\text{degree 2: } \{z, x^2, y^2 + z^2\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{degree 4: } \{z, x^2, xy, y^2, z^2, x^2z, xyz, y^2z, z^3, x^4, x^2(y^2 + z^2), (y^2 + z^2)^2\}, \quad (24)$$

and so on for higher degrees. When r is included as an analytical variable, the highest-degree terms in $V(x, y, z, r)$ must instead take the form $r^s x^p (y^2 + z^2 - 2rz)^q$. In this case the most general quadratic basis, for instance, is $\{z, x^2, y^2 + z^2 - 2rz\}$.

Symmetries of a polynomial constrain its Gram matrix to have block diagonal structure, provided the basis elements in $\mathbf{b}$ are ordered suitably [8, 26, 18]. This is especially simple for a binary symmetry like that of the Lorenz equations. The bounding SDPs demand a Gram matrix $\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0$ such that $\mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}$ is symmetric under $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$. The polynomial basis vector $\mathbf{b}$ generally contains both symmetric and antisymmetric elements, but for $\mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b}$ to be symmetric there can be no cross-multiplication between the two types. Thus we can split the vector $\mathbf{b}$ into vectors of symmetric and antisymmetric elements, $\mathbf{b}_s$ and $\mathbf{b}_a$, in which case $\mathcal{Q}$ is block diagonal:

$$\mathbf{b}^T \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_s^T & \mathbf{b}_a^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q}_s & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{Q}_a \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_s \\ \mathbf{b}_a \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{b}_s^T \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s + \mathbf{b}_a^T \mathcal{Q}_a \mathbf{b}_a. \quad (25)$$

The constraint $\mathcal{Q} \succeq 0$ then decouples into the computationally easier constraints $\mathcal{Q}_s \succeq 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0$, and the general bounding SDPs (9) and (10) become

$$L^* = \max_{\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a} L \quad \text{subject to} \quad \overbrace{\varphi - L + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V}^{S_L(\mathbf{x})} = \mathbf{b}_s^T \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s + \mathbf{b}_a^T \mathcal{Q}_a \mathbf{b}_a, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0,$$

$$U^* = \min_{\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a} U \quad \text{subject to} \quad \overbrace{-[\varphi - U + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V]}^{S_U(\mathbf{x})} = \mathbf{b}_s^T \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s + \mathbf{b}_a^T \mathcal{Q}_a \mathbf{b}_a, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0.$$

We use the formulations (26) and (27) in the following subsections, along with a version of (27) where $\mathbf{b}$ depends analytically on the parameter r as described in §2.3 above.

5.3 Analytical upper bounds on $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ in the Lorenz system

For all $\beta > 0$ and $r > 1$, the mean moments $\bar{z}$ and $\bar{z}^2$ are maximized by trajectories on or tending to the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, meaning that $\bar{z} \leq r - 1$ and $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$.

Both bounds can be proven directly in similar ways, as done by Malkus [20] and Knobloch [16], respectively. However, Hölder's inequality and the fact that $z \geq 0$ pointwise on the attractor give

$$\bar{z} \leq \bar{z}^2^{1/2} \leq \bar{z}^3^{1/3}. \quad (28)$$

The bound $\bar{z} \leq r - 1$ is thus implied by the bound $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$, and both would be implied by $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r - 1)^3$. The latter bound on $\bar{z}^3$ is proven in §5.4, but only for a subset of positive (β, σ) . In the present subsection we show that $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ for all positive (β, σ) . The proof is essentially that of Knobloch, but we illustrate how it can be constructed more systematically using the SDP framework.

5.3.1 Knobloch's proof

The bound $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ can be proven using the sufficient condition (7) with $\varphi = z^2$, $U = (r - 1)^2$, and

$$V(x, y, z, r) = \frac{1}{\beta} [2z - 2rz + \frac{1}{\sigma}x^2 + y^2 + z^2]. \quad (29)$$

These choices define S_U through expression (22), and the desired bound follows if $S_U \geq 0$ for all (x, y, z, r) . Finding that S_U has the SOS representation [16]

$$S_U(x, y, z, r) = [z - (r - 1)]^2 + \frac{2}{\beta}(x - y)^2 \quad (30)$$

thus proves $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ for all $\beta > 0$.

5.3.2 Systematic construction

The preceding argument proves the desired bound but does not illustrate how to come up with the choice (29) for V that makes S_U an SOS polynomial, nor how to find the SOS representation (30). The SDP formulation offers a more systematic approach, which is needed when V and S_U are more complicated, as in the next subsection. The approach consists of two steps: first solving an SDP optimization numerically to find a V ansatz sufficient to construct a sharp bound, and then finding the optimal solution analytically. In the numerical step we solve the SDP (14) with r included as an analytical variable, and we use the upper bound ansatz $U = (r - 1)^2 + u_0$ with the objective of minimizing u_0 . The sharp upper bound $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ can be proven using any V ansatz that gives the optimum $u_0^* = 0$. In the analytical step we solve the SDP (27) for the exactly optimal case where $U = (r - 1)^2$. This latter step is similar to what was done before the introduction of SDP solvers in SOS problems [28] but with the complication that we can freely choose the coefficients of V .

The simplest V ansatz to try is one that includes all possible terms up to quadratic degree. As explained in §5.2 above, the most general choice we must consider is

$$V(x, y, z, r) = c_1 z + c_2 x^2 + c_3 (y^2 + z^2 - 2rz). \quad (31)$$

Using this V ansatz in the numerical SDP optimization (14) at the standard values of (β, σ) , we find an approximate u_0^* that is very near zero. Surmising that the true optimum is $u_0^* = 0$ and so would give a sharp bound, we move to the analytical step. With $\varphi = z^2$, $U = (r - 1)^2$, and the above V , the polynomial S_U defined by (22) is

$$S_U(x, y, z, r) = (r - 1)^2 + c_1 \beta z - 2\beta c_3 r z + 2\sigma c_2 x^2 - (c_1 + 2c_2 \sigma)xy + 2c_3 y^2 + (2\beta c_3 - 1)z^2. \quad (32)$$

This S_U can be represented as $S_U = \mathbf{b}_s \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s + \mathbf{b}_a \mathcal{Q}_a \mathbf{b}_a$ using the monomial basis vectors

$$\mathbf{b}_s = [1 \quad r \quad z]^T, \quad \mathbf{b}_a = [x \quad y]^T. \quad (33)$$

These bases indeed lead to a successful proof, but our eventual choices of the Gram matrices $\mathcal{Q}_s$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a$ would be singular. As described in §5.1 above, it is possible to choose smaller bases $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s$ and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_a$ that lead to a simpler calculation and non-singular Gram matrices. The key observation is that the inequality $S_U(x, y, z, r) \geq 0$ yields a sharp bound only if is an *equality* on the equilibrium the points $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ that saturate the bound (cf. 4.3). This requires that $\mathbf{b}_s^T \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s$ vanish when $z = r - 1$ and $\mathbf{b}_a^T \mathcal{Q}_a \mathbf{b}_a$ vanish when $x = y$, so if the optimal S_U can be represented using the vectors (33), it also can be represented using the single-entry vectors $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s = [z - (r - 1)]$ and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_a = [x - y]$. That is,

$$S_U(x, y, z, r) = \mathcal{Q}_s [z - (r - 1)]^2 + \mathcal{Q}_a (x - y)^2, \quad (34)$$

where the Gram matrices $\mathcal{Q}_s$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a$ are scalars in this case.

Equating expressions (32) and (34) for S_U gives affine constraints that relate the coefficients c_i of V to $\mathcal{Q}_s$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a$. In the present example these constraints uniquely determine all five values as

$$c_1 = 2/\beta, \quad c_2 = 1/\beta\sigma, \quad c_3 = 1/\beta, \quad \mathcal{Q}_s = 1, \quad \mathcal{Q}_a = 2/\beta. \quad (35)$$

In larger SDPs where the affine constraints do not determine all c_i uniquely, the requirements that $\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0$ may constrain the c_i further but still might not determine them uniquely. Although $\mathcal{Q}_s$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a$ in the present example are determined by the affine constraints alone, they are indeed nonnegative when $\beta > 0$, in which case the bound $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ is proven. The values given by (35) yield the same choice (29) for V and SOS representation (30) for S_U that underlie Knobloch's proof [16].

5.4 Analytical upper bound on $\bar{z}^3$ in the Lorenz system

In this subsection we prove that $\bar{z}^3$ is maximized by trajectories on or tending to the nonzero equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, meaning that $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r - 1)^3$, for all $r \geq 1$ and a subset of possible (β, σ) that includes the standard values $(8/3, 10)$. For the (β, σ) where our proof is valid, this result is stronger than the bound $\bar{z}^2 \leq (r - 1)^2$ constructed in the preceding subsection. We treat r analytically as described in §2.3 and thus cannot prove $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r - 1)^3$ directly

since the inequality is false for some $r < 1$. Instead we prove that $(r-1)\overline{z^3} \leq (r-1)^4$ for all r , which implies the desired bound on $\overline{z^3}$ when $r \geq 1$. We let $\rho = r - 1$ and regard V and S_U as polynomials in (x, y, z, ρ) , which leads to a simpler proof than using (x, y, z, r) . In terms of ρ , the bound we construct is $\rho\overline{z^3} \leq \rho^4$.

5.4.1 Numerical determination of an ansatz for $V(x, y, z, \rho)$

First we use numerical SDP optimization to find an ansatz for V that appears to yield a sharp bound at the standard values of (β, σ) , after which we proceed analytically. The SDP (14) is solved with ρ included as an analytical variable, $U = \rho^4 + u_0$, and the objective of minimizing u_0 . We seek a V ansatz that yields the optimum value $u_0^* = 0$. When r is fixed at 28 instead of being treated analytically, quartic V is apparently tight to prove a sharp upper bound (cf. table 4), so we first try a quartic ansatz for $V(x, y, z, \rho)$. The most general quartic V we need to consider includes only symmetric terms, and its highest-degree terms must take the form $\rho^s x^p (y^2 + z^2 - 2\rho z)^q$ in order to avoid any degree-5 terms in $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$. Numerical solution of the SDP yields an optimum u_0^* very near zero, suggesting that a general quartic V is indeed sufficient to prove the tight bound $\rho\overline{z^3} \leq \rho^4$. However, not all terms in this general ansatz are needed. Through a process of trial and error we remove and combine terms, repeatedly solving for u^* while doing so. If removing a term from V makes u^* exceed zero by more than numerical error, the term must be kept. The result of this process is a V ansatz that has few free coefficients and thus leads to tractable analysis. In particular, the ansatz

$$V = c_1 \left[\frac{1}{\sigma} x^4 + (y^2 + z^2 - 2\rho z)^2 + 8\rho^2 (y^2 + z^2 - 2\rho z) + \frac{6}{\sigma} \rho^2 x^2 \right] - c_2 \rho \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} x + y \right)^2 \quad (36)$$

gives $u^* \approx 0$, at least at the standard parameters $(\beta, \sigma) = (8/3, 10)$. The factors of $\frac{1}{\sigma}$ in the above ansatz are included to avoid some parameter-dependence in S_U ; terms in V of the form $\frac{1}{\sigma} x^n$ become σ -independent terms in $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$. Using the above V ansatz, we can prove the sharp upper bound analytically by finding a feasible SDP solution in the exactly optimal case where $U = \rho^4$, or at least showing that such a solution exists.

5.4.2 Analytical SDP solution

The sharp bound $\rho\overline{z^3} \leq \rho^4$ will be proven if the coefficients c_i of the V ansatz (36) can be chosen to make $S_U(x, y, z, \rho)$ an SOS polynomial when $U = \rho^4$. This SOS condition is enforced as in (27) by requiring that S_U can be represented by Gram matrices $\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0$. Applying the V ansatz (36) to the definition (22) of S_U yields a homogenous quartic S_U that can be represented using the quadratic monomial vectors

$$\mathbf{b}_s = [x^2 \quad xy \quad y^2 \quad \rho^2 \quad \rho z \quad z^2]^T, \quad \mathbf{b}_a = [\rho x \quad \rho y \quad xz \quad yz]^T. \quad (37)$$

If the condition $S_U(x, y, z, \rho) \geq 0$ can be satisfied, thereby proving the bound, S_U must vanish at the equilibria $\mathbf{x}^\pm$ that saturate the bound. This is possible only if S_U vanishes

whenever $z = \rho$ and $x = y$. The above monomial basis vectors are thus unnecessarily general, and it suffices to represent S_U using

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s = \begin{bmatrix} x^2 - xy \\ x^2 - y^2 \\ \rho(z - \rho) \\ z(z - \rho) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(x - y) \\ x(z - \rho) \\ y(z - \rho) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

Even with these smaller basis vectors, however, numerical SDP solutions give an approximate $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_s$ that is very close to singular, with a nearly zero eigenvalue corresponding to an eigenvector of approximately $[0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1]^T$. This suggests that the exact Gram matrix has a null space spanned by this vector. As described in §5.1, we can reduce the dimension of $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s$ further by choosing

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s = \begin{bmatrix} x^2 - xy \\ x^2 - y^2 \\ (z - \rho)^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(x - y) \\ x(z - \rho) \\ y(z - \rho) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (39)$$

which leads to a strictly feasible SDP.

The larger bases (37) were needed to solve the SDP optimizations leading to the V ansatz (36), but the reduced bases (39) suffice to represent S_U in the optimal case where $U = \rho^4$. In the present example, the reduction of basis vectors from (37) to (39) was inspired by simple observations. In more complicated cases this reduction must be automated, as in the algorithm of [21].

To complete the proof that $\rho z^3 \leq \rho^4$ we must find symmetric 3×3 matrices $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_a \succeq 0$ that represent S_U with the basis vectors (39). Matching coefficients of $S_U = \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s^T \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_s \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s + \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a^T \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_a \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a$ with those of the expression (22) defining S_U gives 12 independent affine relations between the coefficients of V and the entries of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_s$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_a$. These relations uniquely determine the coefficients of V as

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{4\beta}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\sigma}{2(1 + \sigma)}, \quad (40)$$

and they determine the entries of the Gram matrices up to two degree of freedom. Letting γ_1 and γ_2 denote the $(2, 3)$ and $(3, 3)$ entries of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_a$, respectively, the Gram matrices can be expressed as

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_s = \frac{1}{2\beta} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 1 + 2\beta\gamma_1 \\ -1 & 2 & \beta(\gamma_2 - 1) - 1 \\ 1 + 2\beta\gamma_1 & \beta(\gamma_2 - 1) - 1 & 2\beta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_a = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{6}{\beta} & -\frac{1}{1+\sigma} & -1 \\ -\frac{1}{1+\sigma} & 2(1 - 2\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) & 2\gamma_1 \\ -1 & 2\gamma_1 & 2\gamma_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

Having defined V by (36) with the coefficients (40), we find that S_U and $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} S_U$ both vanish at $\mathbf{x}^\pm$, which is necessary for S_U to produce a sharp bound (cf. §4.3).

The matrices (41) and (42) represent S_U for any $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ but are not necessarily positive semidefinite. If it is possible to choose (γ_1, γ_2) so that $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s, \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a \succeq 0$, then S_U is SOS and proves that $\rho \bar{z}^3 \leq \rho^4$. The SDP is feasible in a region of the (β, σ) plane and strictly feasible on the interior of that region. At each strictly feasible pair (β, σ) , the set of feasible (γ_1, γ_2) is highly constrained by still two-dimensional, and exact $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s, \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a \succ 0$ can be found by projecting an approximate numerical solution onto the rational numbers. Since the present SDP is fairly small, we instead proceed analytically to find the entire region of the (β, σ) plane in which the SDP is feasible—that is, in which there exist (γ_1, γ_2) such that $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s, \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a \succeq 0$.

By Descartes's rule of signs, a symmetric matrix is positive semidefinite if and only if its characteristic polynomial has coefficients that alternate between nonnegative and nonpositive. Requiring this of the characteristic polynomials of $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a$ gives six inequalities. One of these inequalities holds for all positive β , and the other five are

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\beta^2 [4\gamma_1^2 + 2(\gamma_2 - 1)\gamma_1 + (\gamma_2 - 1)^2] + \beta(2 + \gamma_2 - 2\gamma_1) - 1 \geq 0 \\
& \beta^2 [4\gamma_1^2 + (\gamma_2 - 1)^2] + \beta [4\gamma_1 - 2(\gamma_2 + 3)] - 1 \leq 0 \\
& 2\gamma_1(\sigma + 1) [\beta(\sigma + 2) - 12\gamma_2(\sigma + 1)] + \gamma_2 [(\beta + 12)\sigma(\sigma + 2) - 12\gamma_2(\sigma + 1)^2 + 12] \\
& \quad - \beta(\sigma + 1)^2 - 12\gamma_1^2(\sigma + 1)^2 \geq 0 \\
& 4(\sigma + 1)^2 [\beta\gamma_1^2 + 2\gamma_1(\beta\gamma_2 + 3) + \beta(\gamma_2 - 1)\gamma_2] + \beta [\sigma(\sigma + 2) + 2] - 12(\sigma + 1)^2 \leq 0 \\
& \quad \beta(1 - 2\gamma_1) + 3 \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Whether there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying all five inequalities simultaneously depends on (β, σ) . The inequalities are too complicated to reduce by hand but are tractable using computer algebra. Quantifier elimination performed with the Mathematica syntax `Reduce[Exists[{ $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ }, ineq]]`, where `ineq` represents the inequalities (43), reveals that at each $\sigma > 0$ there exist feasible γ_1 and γ_2 over a bounded interval of positive β . Figure 2 shows part of the feasible region in the (β, σ) plane. The upper extent of β is

$$\beta \leq 12 \frac{1 + 2\sigma + \sigma^2}{4 + 4\sigma + \sigma^2},$$

which increases from 3 to 12 as σ varies from 0 to ∞ . The lower extent of β is the smallest root of a particular degree-10 polynomial (omitted here for brevity) whose coefficients are polynomials in σ ; this root decreases very slightly from approximately 0.0456122 to 0.0454294 as σ varies from 0 to ∞ .

Since the shaded region of the (β, σ) plane in figure 2 is where γ_1 and γ_2 can be chosen so that $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s, \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a \succeq 0$, these are the parameters where the SDP is feasible and thereby proves $\rho \bar{z}^3 \leq \rho^4$. We have thus shown for these (β, σ) and all $r \geq 1$ that $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r - 1)^3$ on every




Figure 2: Region of the (β, σ) plane where we have proven that $\bar{z}^3 \leq (r - 1)^3$ when $r \geq 1$. The region includes the classical parameters ($\star$) and extends infinitely to the right as $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$. Outside the shaded region we have neither proven nor disproven the bound, but the bound cannot be proven using the V ansatz of expression (36).

trajectory of the Lorenz system. We cannot say whether the same result holds outside the shaded region. If so, a V ansatz other than (36) is needed to prove the bound because for this ansatz the polynomial S_U cannot be SOS.

5.4.3 Explicit certificate at the standard parameters

The preceding proof that $\rho \bar{z}^3 \leq \rho^4$ in the (β, σ) regime of figure 2 does not provide an easily checked “certificate” that S_U is indeed SOS. Computer algebra was used to determine the (β, σ) at which there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ making the Gram matrices (41)–(42) positive semidefinite, but no explicit expressions were found for these (non-unique) Gram matrices. If desired, one can find explicit semidefinite Gram matrices for particular (β, σ) values by selecting any admissible γ_1 , and γ_2 . Here we illustrate such a selection for the standard parameters $(\beta, \sigma) = (3/8, 10)$.

At the standard values of (β, σ) , the inequalities (43) that are equivalent to the condition $\hat{Q}_s, \hat{Q}_a \succeq 0$ reduce to the four inequalities

$$\frac{1}{33}(8 - 33\gamma_2) - \frac{1}{33}\sqrt{89}\sqrt{9\gamma_2 - 2} \leq \gamma_1 \leq \frac{1}{33}(8 - 33\gamma_2) + \frac{1}{33}\sqrt{89}\sqrt{9\gamma_2 - 2} \quad (44)$$

$$\frac{2}{9} \leq \gamma_2 \leq 0.2370\dots, \quad (45)$$

where $0.2370\dots$ is the smallest real root of the quartic polynomial

$$909988849 - 9432927504\lambda + 49128348096\lambda^2 - 118056102912\lambda^3 + 43717791744\lambda^4.$$

One feasible choice that is particularly simple is $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = (0, 3/8)$. Applying this choice to the Gram matrices (41)–(42) gives an explicit representation of S_U by positive definite matrices,

$$S_U(x, y, z, \rho) = \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s^T \begin{bmatrix} \frac{3}{8} & -\frac{3}{16} & \frac{3}{16} \\ -\frac{3}{16} & \frac{3}{8} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{3}{16} & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s + \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a^T \begin{bmatrix} \frac{9}{8} & -\frac{1}{22} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{22} & \frac{5}{8} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{3}{8} \end{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a, \quad (46)$$

where the basis vectors $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_s$ and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_a$ are as defined by (39).

The entire proof that $\rho \overline{z^3} \leq \rho^4$ when $(\beta, \sigma) = (8/3, 10)$ thus can be summarized as follows. For any differentiable $V(x, y, z, \rho)$,

$$\rho \overline{z^3} = \rho^4 - \overline{S_U}, \quad (47)$$

where in this case $S_U = -[\rho z^3 - \rho^4 + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V]$. Let V be defined by the ansatz (36) with the coefficients (40). For this V , one can check by exact arithmetic that S_U is indeed equal to expression (46), and that the matrices in that expression are positive definite. Thus $\overline{S_U}$ in the equality (47) is nonnegative, and the bound $\rho \overline{z^3} \leq \rho^4$ is proven.

Verifying that the matrices in expression (46) are positive definite confirms that S_U is SOS. Nothing further is proven by finding an explicit SOS representation, but one can be found if desired by computing the Cholesky decompositions $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_s = L_s L_s^T$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_a = L_a L_a^T$ because $S_U = \|L_s^T \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s\|_2^2 + \|L_a^T \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a\|_2^2$ is an SOS expression. For the Gram matrices in expression (46) these Cholesky decompositions are

$$L_s^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \\ 0 & \frac{3}{4} & -\frac{13}{12} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{23}}{6} \end{bmatrix}, \quad L_a^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{3}{2} & -\frac{2}{33} & -\frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{5429}}{66} & -\frac{8}{3\sqrt{5429}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{6607}}{2\sqrt{5429}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (48)$$

The equality $S_U = \|L_s^T \hat{\mathbf{b}}_s\|_2^2 + \|L_a^T \hat{\mathbf{b}}_a\|_2^2$, after some slight simplification in the first term, gives the SOS representation

$$\begin{aligned} S_U(x, y, z, \rho) = & \frac{3}{32} [(x - y)^2 + (z - \rho)^2]^2 + \frac{1}{288} [9(x^2 - y^2) - 13(z - \rho)^2]^2 \\ & + \frac{23}{72} (z - \rho)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{3}{2} \rho(x - y) - \frac{2}{33} x(z - \rho) - \frac{2}{3} y(z - \rho) \right]^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\sqrt{5429}}{66} x(z - \rho) - \frac{8}{3\sqrt{5429}} y(z - \rho) \right]^2 + \frac{6607}{21716} y^2 (z - \rho)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

5.5 Lower bounds of zero in the Lorenz system

All mean symmetric moments of the Lorenz system up to quartic degree are nonnegative at the standard parameters, meaning they are minimized by trajectories on or approaching the zero equilibrium. Since symmetric moments are those taking the form $x^l y^m z^n$ with $l + m$

even, the exponents l, m are either both even or both odd. When l, m are even, $x^l y^m z^n \geq 0$ holds not only on average but also everywhere on the global attractor since $z \geq 0$ on the attractor at all positive parameters (cf. [4]). The five moments with l, m odd— xy , xyz , $x^3 y$, xy^3 , and xyz^2 —need not be nonnegative everywhere on the attractor. Indeed, along a chaotic trajectory at the standard parameters, all five moments are sometimes negative. Nonetheless, the time averages of these moments are nonnegative along every trajectory. For the four moments other than xy^3 these lower bounds follow easily at all positive parameters from (19): the average of each moment is proportional to the average of a different moment that is nonnegative everywhere on the attractor. Below we prove that $\overline{xy^3} \geq 0$ for all σ , positive r , and $\beta \in [6 - 4\sqrt{2}, 6 + 4\sqrt{2}] \approx [0.34, 11.66]$, which includes the standard value $\beta = 8/3$. Nonnegativity of higher-degree mean moments with odd l, m remains to be proven.

To determine a V ansatz that suffices to prove $\overline{xy^3} \geq 0$, we numerically solve the optimization SDP (13), treating r analytically. The analytical treatment of r precludes showing $\overline{xy^3} \geq 0$ directly since the result is false for some negative r values. We can instead show that $rx y^3 \geq 0$ for all r , so we let $\varphi = rxy^3$ and $L = l_0$, and we search for V that give $l_0^* \approx 0$. At the standard values $(\beta, \sigma) = (8/3, 10)$, we find $l^* \approx 0$ using a general quartic ansatz for V . Further numerical trial-and-error suggests that only four terms from the V basis are needed, and their coefficients happen to be independent of β and σ :

$$V(y, z, r) = -r^2 z^2 + ry^2 z + \frac{4}{3} r z^3 - \frac{1}{2} (y^2 + z^2)^2. \quad (50)$$

With the above V , the definition (21) of S_L gives a polynomial that is independent of x ,

$$S_L(y, z, r) = 2\beta r^2 z^2 - (2 + \beta) r y^2 z - 4\beta r z^3 + 2y^4 + 2(1 + \beta) y^2 z^2 + 2\beta z^4. \quad (51)$$

The lower bound $\overline{rxy^3} \geq 0$ will be proven for all r if we can show that S_L is SOS. This SOS condition is enforced as in (26) by requiring that S_L can be represented by some $\mathcal{Q}_s, \mathcal{Q}_a \succeq 0$.

The homogenous quartic polynomial S_L can be represented using the quadratic basis vectors

$$\mathbf{b}_s = [rz \quad y^2 \quad z^2]^T, \quad \mathbf{b}_a = [yz]. \quad (52)$$

We must choose a 3×3 symmetric $\mathcal{Q}_s$ and a scalar $\mathcal{Q}_a$ such that $S_L = \mathbf{b}_s^T \mathcal{Q}_s \mathbf{b}_s + \mathcal{Q}_a y^2 z^2$. Matching the coefficients of this expression with those of (51) gives six constraints that let all entries of $\mathcal{Q}_s$ be either fixed or expressed in terms of $\mathcal{Q}_a$,

$$\mathcal{Q}_s = \begin{bmatrix} 4\beta & -(2 + \beta) & -4\beta \\ -(2 + \beta) & 4 & \frac{1}{2}(4 + 4\beta - \mathcal{Q}_a) \\ -4\beta & \frac{1}{2}(4 + 4\beta - \mathcal{Q}_a) & 4\beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (53)$$

The polynomial $S_L(y, z, r)$ is SOS if and only if we can choose $\mathcal{Q}_a \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_s \succeq 0$, and whether this is possible depends on the value of β . The characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{Q}_s$

takes the form $\lambda^3 + c_2\lambda^2 + c_1\lambda + c_0 = 0$, and by the rule of signs its roots are all nonnegative if and only if $c_2 \leq 0$, $c_1 \geq 0$, and $c_0 \leq 0$. The inequality $c_2 \leq 0$ holds for all positive β since $c_2 = -4(1 + 2\beta)$. The inequality $c_0 \leq 0$ requires that $Q_a = 2\beta$ since $c_0 = \beta(Q_a - 2\beta)^2$. For this Q_a the remaining condition is $c_1 = -(4 - 12\beta + \beta^2) \geq 0$, which holds if and only if $\beta \in [6 - 4\sqrt{2}, 6 + 4\sqrt{2}]$. For this range of β , the polynomial S_L given by (51) is SOS, thereby proving that $rx y^3 \geq 0$. Numerical SDP solutions suggest that the bound holds for other β values also but that different V ansatze are needed to produce S_L that are SOS.

Finding an explicit SOS representation of S_L does not prove anything further but can be done easily if desired. The matrix (53) with $Q_a = 2\beta$ factors into $Q_s = L_s L_s^T$, where

$$L_s^T = \begin{bmatrix} 2\sqrt{\beta} & -\frac{2+\beta}{2\sqrt{\beta}} & -2\sqrt{\beta} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{-(\beta^2-12\beta+4)}}{2\sqrt{\beta}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (54)$$

The polynomial S_L given by (51) therefore can be written as

$$S_L(r, y, z) = \|L_s^T \mathbf{b}_s\|_2^2 + 2\beta y^2 z^2 \quad (55)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4\beta} [4\beta r z - (2 + \beta)y^2 - 4\beta z^2]^2 + \frac{-(\beta^2-12\beta+4)}{4\beta} y^4 + 2\beta y^2 z^2. \quad (56)$$

Expression (56) is SOS when the coefficient of y^4 is nonnegative. This occurs if and only if $\beta \in [6 - 4\sqrt{2}, 6 + 4\sqrt{2}]$, which is exactly the condition for $Q_s \succeq 0$ and for L_s to be real.

6 Conclusions

We have used the framework of semidefinite programming to bound various time-averaged moments, $\overline{x^l y^m z^n}$, of the Lorenz system. The bounds are global in the sense that they apply to all possible trajectories. Rigorous bounds have been obtained in two different ways: by analytically finding exact solutions to SDPs (or showing that such solutions exist), and by using interval arithmetic. Most of the bounds we have constructed are novel, many are very tight, and some are perfectly sharp, thereby demonstrating that the complicated phase space of a chaotic system does not prevent the SDP approach from succeeding. We are not aware of any other approach that can produce rigorous bounds of this quality, except on the handful of mean quantities where proofs are simple enough to be constructed without computer assistance.

The bounds we have reported that are not perfectly sharp have been computed with the software VSDP [13], which uses interval arithmetic to rigorously enclose optima of SDPs. This approach is convenient to implement and increases the conservativeness of bounds only slightly. Perfectly sharp bounds can be proven in cases where they are saturated by equilibrium points, but this requires verifying exactly optimal SDP solutions, which cannot be done using interval arithmetic. In such cases we have studied the relevant SDPs analytically, proving the apparently novel bounds $\overline{z^3} \leq (r - 1)^3$ and $\overline{xy^3} \geq 0$ for large ranges of the parameters (β, σ, r) .

One remaining challenge is to construct sharp bounds that require exactly optimal solutions to SDPs that are too large to study analytically. Such an example is the conjectured bound $\overline{x^2z} \leq \beta(r-1)^2$ in the Lorenz system at the standard parameters; our bound on $\overline{x^2z}$ was constructed using interval arithmetic and so is very slightly conservative. The sharp bound might be proven using symbolic-numerical algorithms that project approximate numerical solutions onto exact rational ones [27, 15, 38]. A potential difficulty is that these algorithms are guaranteed to succeed (given enough precision) only if the SDP to be solved is strictly feasible, whereas exactly optimal solutions are marginally feasible in general. Projection might still succeed in marginal cases [27], and if not it is sometimes possible to formulate a strictly feasible SDP by reducing the polynomial basis. We carried out such reduction analytically in §5.3 and §5.4, and the algorithm of [21] offers an automated approach for larger SDPs. A final impediment to proofs using rational projection is that an optimal Gram matrix with solely rational entries does not exist when the optimum value is irrational and possibly in other cases also [12].

Proving bounds on all possible trajectories yields global conclusions in a way that computing particular trajectories cannot. In the Lorenz system, for instance, it is not possible to compute every periodic orbit since there are infinitely many. On the other hand, global bounds can be unnecessarily conservative if one is interested only in particular trajectories. In the Lorenz system, one might want bounds that apply to chaotic trajectories but not necessarily to unstable periodic orbits or equilibria. The nonzero equilibria are separate from the strange attractor, and bounds that omit these solutions could be proven by enforcing bounding conditions on only a subset of phase space that does not contain these points. This approach succeeded for the van der Pol oscillator [6], but our preliminary efforts with the Lorenz system have been plagued by poor numerical conditioning. We are not aware of a method for excluding unstable trajectories that are embedded in the strange attractor, such as periodic orbits or the equilibrium at the origin. Adding finite noise as in [6] can give bounds on stochastic expectations that are close to chaotic time averages, but here too we find numerical difficulties. Proving bounds that apply only to particular trajectories seems to require progress both in formulating bounding conditions as SDPs and in improving the numerical conditioning of the SDPs that arise. Nevertheless, the methods used in the present work can produce very tight global bounds in chaotic systems. Applying them to nearly any low-dimensional dissipative system is likely to yield novel results.

Acknowledgements

The author was partially supported during this work by the James Van Loo Post-Doctoral Fellowship and the NSF awards PHY-1205219 and DMS-1515161. The author thanks Divakar Viswanath for providing numerically computed periodic orbits of the Lorenz system. This work has benefited from conversations with Sergei Chernyshenko, Giovanni Fantuzzi, and Charles R. Doering.

A Details of verified computations using VSDP

When computing the bounds reported in tables 4 and 5 with the software VSDP, we typically used a Lorenz system rescaled by $\mathbf{x} \mapsto 20\mathbf{x}$ and then converted results back to the original scaling. Various researchers using SOS methods to study dynamical systems (although not to bound time averages) have found that rescaling improves the convergence of SDP solvers. A heuristic that is often used (e.g. [9]) is to rescale each coordinate of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that the relevant dynamics occur approximately in the cube $[-1, 1]^n$. Our rescaling is similar, putting most of the Lorenz attractor in the domain $[-1, 1]^2 \times [0, 2]$. We find that rescaling by 10 or 40 instead of 20 typically gives more conservative upper enclosures of U^* and thus worse verified bounds. Results become more sensitive to the rescaling when $V(\mathbf{x})$ reaches degree 8 or 10, at which point slightly different scalings can significantly affect the conservativeness of the enclosures. The degree-10 bounds in table 5 were produced after rescaling by either 25 (for x^4, x^2y^2, xy^3) or 30, and the degree-8 lower enclosure in table 4 was produced after rescaling by 10. The time required to compute each tabulated bound on a single processor ranges from seconds to minutes.

Results reported here for $V(\mathbf{x})$ of degree 6, 8, or 10 are not quite rigorous to the standard of a computer-assisted proof. This is because we have used the software YALMIP [17, 18] to automatically parse the SOS conditions, formulate corresponding SDPs, and pass them to the VSDP software. This incurs roundoff errors that are not accounted for since YALMIP does not use interval arithmetic. A parser that uses interval arithmetic is under development. Until it is available, rigorous results can be found by formulating the relevant SDPs manually. We have done this only for $V(\mathbf{x})$ of degree 4, in which cases roundoff errors introduced by YALMIP have all been orders of magnitude smaller than the margins of the enclosures generated by VSDP.

B Relations between mean moments

On any trajectory of the Lorenz system, all mean moments up to degree 2, 3, or 4 that are symmetric under $(x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)$ can be expressed as linear combinations of $\{\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2\}$, $\{\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2, \overline{y^2z}, \bar{z}^3\}$, or $\{\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2, \overline{y^2z}, \bar{z}^3, \overline{y^2z^2}, \bar{z}^4\}$, respectively. Such expressions are derived using the identity $\mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V = 0$ that is central to the bounding methods of the present work. When proving bounds we have sought V such that $\varphi + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$ obeys the desired bound at all points in phase space. For the alternate objective of expressing various moments in terms of a smaller subset of moments, V must be chosen so that $\varphi + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V$ contains only moments from this subset. Table 6 gives relations for symmetric moments of the Lorenz system, as well as the choices of $V(x, y, z)$ that yield these relations. Every tabulated moment is expressed as a linear combination of moments that either are in the minimal set $\{\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2, \overline{y^2z}, \bar{z}^3, \overline{y^2z^2}, \bar{z}^4\}$ or are expressed in this same way higher in the table. Each moment can be expressed using only the minimal set after some further algebra: $\overline{x^2} = \beta\bar{z}$, $\overline{y^2} = \beta(r\bar{z} - \bar{z}^2)$, $\overline{x^2z} = \beta(1 + \sigma)(r - 1)\bar{z} - \beta\sigma\bar{z}^2$, and so on.

Table 6: Symmetric mean moments up to quartic degree expressed as linear combinations of moments that either are in the minimal set $\{\bar{z}, \bar{z}^2, \bar{y}^2\bar{z}, \bar{z}^3, \bar{y}^2\bar{z}^2, \bar{z}^4\}$ or are expressed in this same way higher in the table. Each equality is an instance of the identity $\bar{\varphi} = \overline{\varphi + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V}$ with φ and V defined as shown.

$\bar{\varphi} = \overline{\varphi + \mathbf{f} \cdot \nabla V}$	$V(x, y, z)$
$\overline{xy} = \beta \bar{z}$	$-z$
$\overline{x^2} = \overline{xy}$	$\frac{1}{2\sigma}x^2$
$\overline{y^2} = r\overline{xy} - \beta\bar{z}^2$	$\frac{1}{2}(y^2 + z^2)$
$\overline{x^2z} = r\overline{x^2} - (1 + \sigma)\overline{xy} + \sigma\overline{y^2}$	xy
$\overline{xyz} = \beta\bar{z}^2$	$-\frac{1}{2}z^2$
$\overline{x^3y} = (\beta + 2\sigma)\overline{x^2z} - 2\sigma\overline{xyz}$	$-x^2z$
$\overline{x^4} = \overline{x^3y}$	$\frac{1}{4\sigma}x^4$
$\overline{xyz^2} = \beta\bar{z}^3$	$-\frac{1}{3}z^3$
$\overline{xy^3} = (2 + \beta)\overline{y^2z} - 2r\overline{xyz} + 2\overline{xyz^2}$	$-y^2z$
$\overline{x^2z^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \beta + 2\sigma} \left[\sigma(\sigma + 1)\overline{y^2z} + r(1 + \sigma)\overline{x^2z} \right. \\ \left. - (1 + \sigma)(1 + \beta + \sigma)\overline{xyz} + r\overline{x^3y} + \sigma\overline{xy^3} + \sigma\overline{xyz^2} \right]$	$\frac{2(1 + \sigma)xyz + x^2(y^2 + z^2)}{2(1 + \beta + 2\sigma)}$
$\overline{x^2y^2} = -\sigma\overline{y^2z} - r\overline{x^2z} + (1 + \beta + \sigma)\overline{xyz} + \overline{x^2z^2}$	$-xyz$
$\overline{y^4} = r\overline{xy^3} + r\overline{xyz^2} - (1 + \beta)\overline{y^2z^2} - \beta\bar{z}^4$	$\frac{1}{4}(y^2 + z^2)^2$

References

- [1] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [2] S. I. Chernyshenko, P. Goulart, D. Huang, and A. Papachristodoulou. Polynomial sum of squares in fluid dynamics: a review with a look ahead. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 372:20130350, 2014.
- [3] P. Cvitanović, R. Artuso, R. Mainieri, G. Tanner, and G. Vattay. *Chaos: classical and quantum*, *ChaosBook.org*. Niels Bohr Institute, 2016.

- [4] C. R. Doering and J. D. Gibbon. *Applied analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [5] B. Eckhardt and G. Ott. Periodic orbit analysis of the Lorenz attractor. *Zeitschrift Phys. B*, 93:259–266, 1994.
- [6] G. Fantuzzi, D. Goluskin, D. Huang, and S. I. Chernyshenko. Bounds for deterministic and stochastic dynamical systems using sum-of-squares optimization. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15:1962–1988, 2016.
- [7] C. Foias, M. Jolly, I. Kukavica, and E. Titi. The Lorenz equation as a metaphor for the Navier–Stokes equations. *Discret. Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 7:403–429, 2001.
- [8] K. Gatermann and P. A. Parrilo. Symmetry groups, semidefinite programs, and sums of squares. *J. Pure Appl. Algebr.*, 192:95–128, 2004.
- [9] D. Henrion and M. Korda. Convex computation of the region of attraction of polynomial control systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 59:297–312, 2014.
- [10] D. Henrion, S. Naldi, and M. Safey El Din. Exact algorithms for linear matrix inequalities. *arXiv:1508.03715v3*, 2016.
- [11] D. Hilbert. Ueber die darstellung definiter formen als summe von formenquadraten. *Math. Ann.*, 32:342–350, 1888.
- [12] C. J. Hillar. Sums of squares over totally real fields are rational sums of squares. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 137:921–930, 2009.
- [13] C. Jansson. VSDP: a MATLAB software package for verified semidefinite programming. Technical report, Hamburg University of Technology, 2006.
- [14] E. Kaltofen, B. Li, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Exact certification of global optimality of approximate factorizations via rationalizing sums-of-squares with floating point scalars. In *Proc. Twenty-First Int. Symp. Symbolic Algebraic Comput.*, 2008.
- [15] E. L. Kaltofen, B. Li, Z. Yang, and L. Zhi. Exact certification in global polynomial optimization via sums-of-squares of rational functions with rational coefficients. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 47:1–15, 2012.
- [16] E. Knobloch. On the statistical dynamics of the Lorenz model. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 20: 695–709, 1979.
- [17] J. Löfberg. YALMIP : a toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Aided Control Syst. Des.*, pages 284–289, Taipei, Taiwan, 2004.

- [18] J. Löfberg. Pre- and post-processing sum-of-squares programs in practice. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 54:1007–1011, 2009.
- [19] E. N. Lorenz. Deterministic nonperiodic flow. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 20:130–141, 1963.
- [20] W. V. R. Malkus. Non-periodic convection at high and low Prandtl number. *Mémoires la Société R. des Sci. Liège, Collect. IV*, 6:125–128, 1972.
- [21] D. Monniaux and P. Corbineau. On the generation of Positivstellensatz witnesses in degenerate cases. In *Proc. Interactive Theorem Proving*, pages 249–264. Springer, 2011.
- [22] MOSEK ApS. The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 7.1 (Revision 54), 2015.
- [23] K. G. Murty and S. N. Kabadi. Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and non-linear programming. *Math. Program.*, 39:117–129, 1987.
- [24] J. Nie, K. Ranestad, and B. Sturmfels. The algebraic degree of semidefinite programming. *Math. Program. Ser. A*, 122:379–405, 2010.
- [25] P. A. Parrilo. Semidefinite programming relaxations for semialgebraic problems. *Math. Program. Ser. B*, 96:293–320, 2003.
- [26] P. A. Parrilo. Exploiting algebraic structure in sum of squares programs. In D. Henrion and A. Garulli, editors, *Posit. Polynomials Control*, pages 181–194. Springer, 2005.
- [27] H. Peyrl and P. A. Parrilo. Computing sum of squares decompositions with rational coefficients. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 409:269–281, 2008.
- [28] V. Powers and T. Wörmann. An algorithm for sums of squares of real polynomials. *J. Pure Appl. Algebr.*, 127:99–104, 1998.
- [29] S. M. Rump. INTLAB – INTerval LABoratory. In T. Csendes, editor, *Dev. Reliable Comput.*, pages 77–104. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- [30] M. Safey El Din and L. Zhi. Computing rational points in convex semi-algebraic sets and sos decompositions. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 20:2876–2889, 2010.
- [31] A. N. Souza and C. R. Doering. Maximal transport in the Lorenz equations. *Phys. Lett. A*, 379:518–523, 2015.
- [32] C. Sparrow. *The Lorenz Equations: Bifurcations, Chaos, and Strange Attractors*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [33] P. Swinnerton-Dyer. Bounds for trajectories of the Lorenz equations: an illustration of how to choose Liapunov functions. *Phys. Lett. A*, 281:161–167, 2001.

- [34] W. Tucker. The Lorenz attractor exists. *Comptes Rendus l'Académie des Sci. Série I*, 328:1197–1202, 1999.
- [35] R. H. Tütüncü, K. C. Toh, and M. J. Todd. Solving semidefinite-quadratic-linear programs using SDPT3. *Math. Program.*, 95:189–217, 2003.
- [36] D. Viswanath. Symbolic dynamics and periodic orbits of the Lorenz attractor. *Nonlinearity*, 16:1035–1056, 2003.
- [37] D. Viswanath. The fractal property of the Lorenz attractor. *Phys. D Nonlinear Phenom.*, 190:115–128, 2004.
- [38] M. Wu, Z. Yang, and W. Lin. Exact asymptotic stability analysis and region-of-attraction estimation for nonlinear systems. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.*, 2013:146137, 2013.